

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,448	12/04/2000	Joseph A. Porkka	MS150750.1	6259
27195 75	590 09/30/2004		EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP			ROCHE, TRENTON J	
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/729,448	PORKKA, JOSEPH A.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	-			
	Trent J Roche	2124				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate) atimely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of see under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office mely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply of the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>23 August 2004</u>. Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 						
The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,7-25						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
0. Other:		•				
S. Carlotte and C. Carlotte an						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Examiner does not see any distinction between a "virtual build machine process" executing on a single computer along with the first and second component as in the present invention, and the system disclosed by Boehm et al. In the case of the "virtual build machine processes," the single computer would still be linking and distributing files to itself, as the virtual build machine processes are executing on the single computer. Regardless of how futile or unnecessary the actions may be, as was shown in the prior office actions, Boehm et al discloses a first component, second component, and storing of the files locally. The rejections of claims 1-4 and 7-25 are maintained.

Karan' Char

KAKALI CHANI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100